DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 215 058 UD 022 229

AUTHOR Johnsen, E. P.; Tracy, D. B.
TITLE A Report on the Relationships among the How I See Myself Questionnaire, Behavior Rating Scales and Achievement.
PUB DATE [82]
NOTE 28p.; Not available in paper copy due to authors' restrictions.

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; *Adjustment (to Environment); *Children; *Coping; Correlation; Grade 3; *Interpersonal Competence; Personality Traits; Primary Education; *Self Concept; Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

Urban and rural third graders were studied to test the hypothesis that children's self-reported views of their ability to cope with the environment and their teacher's views of their performance patterns in adaptation and intrapersonal growth would have correlations with academic test performance. Teacher appraisals of adaptation covered dependency, ability to follow instructions, enthusiasm, and learning difficulties; appraisals of intrapersonal growth included happiness, response to illness, sociability, and maturity. Children's self-perceptions were measured on the How I Myself scale; teacher's evaluations of pupils were obtained through the Pupil Behavior Rating scale; and scores from the most recent achievement battery were derived from school records. There was a modest but consistent relationship between self-perception and achievement in that as difficulties were perceived and increased, academic achievement decreased. It could not be determined if this finding demonstrated a cause-effect relationship. For the most part, children rated high on adaptation (i.e. having difficulty in adapting to the school environment) or intrapersonal growth (i.e. displaying immature behavior or suffering frequent illness or depression) had consistently lower achievement scores. (MJL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED215058

A Report on the Relationships Among the How I See Myself Questionnaire, the Behavior Rating Scales and Achievement

E.P. Johnsen and D.B. Tracy

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E.P. Johnsen
D.B. Tracy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

University of Kansas

UD 022 221

A Report on the Relationships Among the
How I See Myself Questionnaire,
the Behavior Rating Scales and Achievement

E.P. Johnsen and D.B. Tracy
University of Kansas

A large number of variables influence the academic performance of school age children: IQ, level of development, attitude toward school and self, home background, etc. This study considered two characteristics mentioned in educational literature, children's views of patterns of their own behaviors and two clusters of non-intellectual behaviors that are identified as the Adaptation and Interpersonal dimensions. It was hypothesized that these two phenomena, children's self reported views of their own patterns of coping with the environment and their teacher's views of their performance patterns in the Adaptation and Interpersonal dimensions would have strong associations with achievement test performances.

The report of our findings are described in the three sections which follow. First a description of procedures and participants in the study; second an analysis of the children's views of themselves; and third, an examination of the teacher's ratings of non-intellectual behavior patterns for their pupils.

Part one: Participants and procedures

The sample

Two groups of third grade children participated in this study. The rural sample was drawn from students in Kansas public school districts located east of a line from Republic county on the north to Sumner county on the south. Only districts having no city with a population of more than 3,500 within their boundaries were included. This group of unified districts totaled 155. Twelve schools were randomly selected for participation in the study, and twelve did participate. An urban group of children was drawn from the four largest metro-

politan areas within the state and was designated as the urban sample. Two districts agreed to participate. The final sample of children consisted of 54 urban boys, 65 urban girls, 214 rural boys and 192 rural girls.

Procedures

All children were administered two forms of the How-I-See-Myself (HISM) scale which assesses the child's perception of his/her own abilities to cope with the environment. High scores indicate an increase on the difficulty of dealing with environmental problems. Form S of the scale attempts to measure how each child feels that day; form T assesses typical patterns of self-reported feelings. A cassette-slide presentation of the questions was used to observate reading problems. Children were tested in groups and marked individual answer sheets. All participants were retested after a minimum six week interval to measure the stability (reliability) of the children's perceptions.

Scores from the most recent achievement battery were obtained from school records. Classroom teachers completed the Pupil Behavior Rating Scale (PBRS) for each child in the study. The PBRS contains three dimensions measuring non-intellectual behavior characteristics of elementary children. Two of these dimensions include characteristics which have shown strong relationships with academic success and were selected for this study, viz. an adaptation dimension (dependency, ability to follow instructions, enthusiasm, learning difficulties) and an intrapersonal dimension (happiness, response to illness, sociability and maturity). Each child was rated once by the classroom teacher on the PBRS which provides for comparison of subjects' behavior with scaled values (behavior descriptions of children) at various points along the attribute in question.

Statistical Method

Scores were collected for each child on the HISM scales S and T on two occasions. In addition, BRS ratings were obtained from the teachers, and achievement test scores were obtained from school records. Where possible, a reading

achievement score, an arithmetic achievement score and a total achievement score was obtained for each child. There were missing data for some children, and not every child was present for both administrations of the HISM. Therefore, statistics were based on data that were available for the particular variable, and sample sizes varied from one variable to another.

To investigate the relationships between the S and T subscales of the HISM, the Adaptation and Interpersonal scales of the PBRS, and the achievement score, Pearson correlation coefficients were computed within each classroom, and then averaged separately for rural boys and girls and urban boys and girls. Because correlation coefficients are affected by differences between groups, the average coefficients were felt to be more indicative of actual relationships than those found by combining all data.

For each mean correlation coefficient, a standard error was computed which is an indicator of the accuracy of the mean correlation coefficient as an estimator of the population correlation coefficient. Any mean correlation coefficient was declared significant if the probability that it could have been randomly sampled from a population in which the true correlation was zero was .05 or less. In some instances larger correlations were declared non significant while smaller ones were declared significant. This was due to differences in standard errors or to different sample sizes in these instances.

Centile ranks were also computed for the first trial of the HISM scales. Centile ranks indicate for each score, the percentage of children at that grade level who would be expected to make a lower score.

Part two: Children's view of themselves

The mean correlations between the different administrations of the HISM are shown in Tables 1 through 4. The children's reports of their self-views was reasonably stable from the first administration to the second, and each child's self-report was internally consistent, as shown by the reliability coefficients in Table 5, with the exception of one or two items, e.g. I feel

jittery. This is likely due to a misunderstanding of a few of the items by this age group.

Sex differences did appear on this scale with girls consistently seeing themselves as more susceptible to stress. Some writers have suggested that girls report their feelings or views more openly, i.e. they are less defensive than boys, but recent studies have not supported a differential effect of defensiveness for older elementary girls. Differences between communities generally did not appear in children's reports of their own feelings. In only one administration of the questionnaires did urban children (boys) seem to feel more threatened than their rural counterparts. However this was not part of a larger pattern. Accordingly we conclude that for sizeable groups at least, children do not seem to feel significantly different about themselves as a function of the size or type of community they live. Of course other characteristics not detected by this questionnaire (e.g. personality traits or social values) may still act to discriminate urban from rural children.

Mean correlations between achievement test scores and the HISM are shown in tables 6 through 9. The relationships between achievement test scores and HISM responses were very modest and generally negative. That is, children who see themselves as more adjusted and free from problems or threats generally do better on school achievement test, but this is a relatively weak relationship. The norms for urban and rural boys and girls are shown in Tables 10 and 11.

To summarize the investigation of the How-I-See-Myself-Scale, we can say it is a reasonably stable and consistent measure for large groups of children. Almost no differences in how children see themselves coping with every day problems appeared between rural and urban children; girls did appear to report more difficulties in dealing with daily stress than boys did. There was a modest but consistent relationship between self-perception and achievement in that as difficulties in self-perception increase, academic achievement decreases.

Of course one does not know if there is a cause effect relationship here. It could be that children who do better in those areas measured by achievement tests tend to view themselves as coping more positively, or it could be vice-versa. We recommend continued use of this scale as a research tool for groups of children. Children cannot report sufficient information about their own functioning on this standardized instrument to allow for individual predictions.

Part three: The teachers view of the children

All children in the study were rated by their regular classroom teacher on the Pupil Behavior Rating Scale (PBRS). This scale rates children on factors which contribute to school performance but which in themselves are non-intellective, i.e. not measured directly by intelligence or achievement tests. Two dimensions which have been shown to influence reading achievement in first and second grades were also used in this study, Adaptation and Intrapersonal functioning.

Ratings Scores and Achievement

Tables 12 through 15 show the mean correlations between the BRS subscales and the achievement test scores. The attributes which define the dimension called adaptation include subjects displaying difficulties in following directions, in being able to work independently, in maintaining interest in school, i.e. in learning subject matter as a function of not adapting well to the school environment. Children rated high on this dimension consistently scored less will on overall achievement test scores and on several subtests. This factor seems to have the strongest negative relationship with achievement.

Attributes which define the dimension named intrapersonal includes children who are seen as immature, suffering frequent illness, unhappy, withdrawn, fearful or depressed.

Children who were rated high on this dimension also performed less well on achievement batteries. However, the pattern was less consistent. The intrapersonal factors for urban boys, for example, were not significantly related to their achievement patterns; for urban girls, the relationship was somewhat stronger but still less revealing than the relationship between adaptation and achievement. For rural children the relationship between poor intrapersonal functioning and lower achievement was stronger and more consistent, but it also did not reach the strength between adaptation and achievement.

At least one factor may account for these differences. Teachers find failure to adapt to the school environment more obvious. Children who have not adjusted intrapersonally in that they are withdrawn or friendless are less noticeable and their functioning may merely be regarded as shyness.

To summarize, teachers can use the PBRS to discriminate between children on their adaptation to school and on their general intrapersonal adjustment. The strongest relationship found was between achievement performance and how well the child has adjusted to the demands of the school program. A less substantial but significant relationship was found between lower achievement and intrapersonal problems.

Several speculations seem warranted. First children do not automatically shift from behavior patterns that promote success at home or in the community to those which facilitate achievement in school. The school, one may suggest, is not only an unnatural environment for a primary child (in the sense that past coping skills may not be relevant) but a change of environment that is substantial. Other studies have shown differential adjustment to school in the first two grades; this pattern seems to continue in grade three. If school adjustment can be taught, and there is no reason to suggest it can't, schools may wish to direct attention to helping children learn how to learn, and devote somewhat less energy to perfecting skills in content areas. Teachers may find it more difficult, given the complexities of the modern school, to notice those be-

havior patterns which reflect intrapersonal problems. Undoubtedly aggressive and distractable children may demand teacher attention; we wonder how much sustained effort remains for observing the unhappy child. Finally, it should be kept in mind that many other factors including interpersonal functioning, intellectual development, and home experiences may also influence school performance. These have not been examined in this study.

This type of rating scale is a useful device practically and for research purposes. The anchored scale appears superior to checklist devices in allow greater comparability of ratings across teachers.

Relationship between Ratings and Self-perception

Tables 16 through 19 show the correlations between the BRS and the HISM scales. Positive relationships were expected between the Adaptation and Interpersonal subscales of the BRS and the T scale of the HISM. These relationships were significant in some cases, but always low. This adds some support to the validity of the HISM as an indicator of school related problems. However, the low relationships probably indicate as well some of the difficulties of using paper and pencil instruments with children as young as grade 3, and the fact that the HISM does not specifically deal with school related feelings and behaviors.

Table 1
Urban boys HISM mean correlations,
standard errors, and group sizes for k=4 classrooms

Variable		Trial 1 HISM	Trial 1 HISM	Trial 2 HISM	Trial 2 HISM
HISM Trial 1	$\bar{r}$	.402*			
	SE $\bar{r}$	.117			
	n	51			
HISM Trial 2	$\bar{r}$	.422	.262		
	SE $\bar{r}$	.133	.197		
	n	46	45		
HISM Trial 2	$\bar{r}$	.330*	.499*	.508	
	SE $\bar{r}$	.086	.094	.191	
	n	46	45	48	
	Mean	30.45	37.21	30.86	36.82
	SD	6.72	6.98	6.59	6.87
	n	52	51	48	48

*p <.05; df=3

Table 2
Urban girls - STAIC mean correlations,
standard errors and group sizes for k=4 classrooms

Variable		Trial 1		Trial 2	
Trial 1	$\bar{r}$	.198			
	SE $\bar{r}$	.119			
	n	61			
Trial 2	$\bar{r}$	.638**	.298**		
	SE $\bar{r}$	.044	.046		
	n	57	56		
	$\bar{r}$	.217	.340	.475*	
	SE $\bar{r}$	.141	.117	.144	
	n	57	57	60	
	Mean	27.52	38.02	29.60	37.52
	SD	5.40	5.95	7.32	7.18
	n	61	62	60	60

* $p < .05$; df=3
** $p < .01$; df=3

Table 3
Rural boys HISM mean correlations,
standard errors, and group sizes for k=17 classrooms

Variable		Trial 1 HISM	Trial 1 HISM	Trail 2 HISM	Trail 2 HISM
HISM Trial 1	$\bar{r}$	.378**			
	SE $\bar{r}$	.058			
	n	203			
HISM Trial 2	$\bar{r}$	.572**	.314**		
	SE $\bar{r}$	.056	.053		
	n	195	197		
HISM Trial 2	$\bar{r}$	.283**	.631**	.398**	
	SE $\bar{r}$	.073	.061	.065	
	n	195	197	204	
	Mean	28.68	36.64	28.67	34.28
	SD	5.20	6.43	5.98	7.63
	n	204	206	204	204

**p <.01; df=16

Table 4
Rural girls HISM mean correlations,
standard errors, and group sizes for k=17 classrooms

Variable		Trial 1 HISM	Trial 1 HISM	Trial 2 HISM	Trial 2 HISM
HISM Trial 1	$\bar{r}$	.453**			
	SE $\bar{r}$	.047			
	n	187			
HISM Trial 2	$\bar{r}$	.553**	.408**		
	SE $\bar{r}$	.065	.045		
	n	178	178		
HISM Trial 2	$\bar{r}$	.331**	.612**	.477**	
	SE $\bar{r}$	.067	.048	.046	
	n	178	178	180	
	Mean	29.91	39.03	28.49	37.52
	SD	6.38	6.08	5.47	6.56
	n	189	189	184	184

**p < .01; df=16

Table 5
Coefficient alpha reliability coefficients for HISM
State and Trait scales

Variable	Urban		Rural	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
Trial 1				
HISM-S	.894	.833	.836	.890
HISM-T	.800	.814	.803	.829
Trial 2				
HISM-S	.874	.910	.872	.883
HISM-T	.785	.848	.870	.828

Table 6
Urban boys mean correlations between the
HISM and achievement scores

Variable		Trial 1 HISM-S	Trial 1 HISM-T	Trial 2 HISM-S	Trial 2 HISM-T
Total Achievement	$\bar{r}$	.026	-.083	-.142	-.025
	SE $\bar{r}$	.123	.236	.205	.157
	n	50	49	46	46
	k	4	4	4	4
Reading	$\bar{r}$	.006	-.156	-.266	-.227
	SE $\bar{r}$	.195	.261	.224	.239
	n	50	49	46	46
	k	4	4	4	4
Mathematics	$\bar{r}$	.063	-.181	-.045	.093
	SE $\bar{r}$	.116	.164	.317	.146
	n	50	49	46	46
	k	4	4	4	4
Language Arts	$\bar{r}$	-.087	.160	-.300	-.053
	SE $\bar{r}$	.262	.325	.329	.319
	n	26	25	24	24
	k	3	3	3	3

Table 7
Urban girls mean correlations between the HISM and achievement scores

Variable		Trial 1 HISM-S	Trial 1 HISM-T	Trial 2 HISM-S	Trial 2 HISM-T
Total Achievement	$\bar{r}$	-.122	-.169	-.122	-.263
	SE $\bar{r}$	.143	.166	.161	.114
	n	57	57	53	53
	k	4	4	4	4
Reading	$\bar{r}$	-.113	-.258	-.082	-.211
	SE $\bar{r}$	.198	.157	.214	.113
	n	57	57	53	53
	k	4	4	4	4
Mathematics	$\bar{r}$	-.095	-.064	-.034	-.198
	SE $\bar{r}$	.122	.171	.130	.104
	n	57	57	53	53
	k	4	4	4	4
Language Arts	$\bar{r}$	-.183	-.131	-.285	-.470
	SE $\bar{r}$	.038	.288	.237	.139
	n	27	27	25	25
	k	3	3	3	3

Table 8
Rural boys - mean correlation between the
HISM and achievement scores

Variable		Trial 1 HISM-S	Trial 1 HISM-T	Trial 2 HISM-S	Trial 2 HISM-T
Total Achievement	$\bar{r}$	.048	-.231*	.006	-.215
	SE $\bar{r}$	.081	.103	.112	.137
	n	161	163	162	162
	k	14	14	14	14
Reading	$\bar{r}$	.047	-.189	.014	-.067
	SE $\bar{r}$	.060	.092	.087	.143
	n	189	191	191	191
	k	17	17	17	17
Mathematics	$\bar{r}$	.074	-.157	.038	-.146
	SE $\bar{r}$	.105	.090	.112	.090
	n	188	190	190	190
	k	17	17	17	17
Language Arts	$\bar{r}$	-.189	-.356**	-.298**	-.396
	SE $\bar{r}$	.101	.063	.070	.202
	n	76	76	77	77
	k	6	6	6	6

*P < .05; df=k-1
**p < .01; df=k-1

Table 9
Rural girls - mean correlations between the HISM and achievement scores

Variable		Trial 1 HISM-S	Trial 1 HISM-T	Trial 2 HISM-S	Trial 2 HISM-T
Total Achievement	$\bar{r}$	-.035	-.041	.076	-.108
	SE $\bar{r}$	.070	.076	.084	.059
	n	132	132	130	130
	k	13	13	13	13
Reading	$\bar{r}$	-.079	-.016	.073	-.105
	SE $\bar{r}$	.062	.071	.079	.055
	n	155	155	153	145
	k	15	15	15	15
Mathematics	$\bar{r}$	-.017	-.145	.089	-.070
	SE $\bar{r}$	.078	.097	.085	.071
		154	154	151	152
	k	15	15	15	15
Language Arts	$\bar{r}$	-.143	-.104	.088	.066
	SE $\bar{r}$	.075	.093	.089	.073
	n	70	70	69	69
	k	5	5	5	5

Table 10
Centile ranks for the HISM-S Scale (Grade 3)

	GROUP			
	Rural Boys	Rural Girls	Urban Boys	Urban Girls
Score	Centile Rank	Centile Rank	Centile Rank	Centile Rank
20	1	1	-	-
21	5	3	2	4
22	9	6	5	11
23	13	11	8	16
24	20	16	15	22
25	28	23	24	31
26	36	32	32	47
27	44	39	43	59
28	51	47	52	67
29	60	53	59	77
30	67	60	65	78
31	74	68	72	82
32	80	73	79	84
33	85	77	80	85
34	88	80	82	88
35	89	83	84	89
36	91	86	86	89
37	92	87	87	91
38	93	89	89	93
39	94	92	89	94
40	95	93	89	95
41	95	94	89	97
42	96	95	89	98
43	97	96	91	99
44	98	96	92	99
45	99	97	93	99
46	99	97	95	99
47	-	98	96	-
48	-	98	97	-
49	-	98	98	-
50	-	98	98	-
51	-	98	99	-
52	-	98	99	-
53	-	98	99	-
54	-	98	99	-
55	-	98	-	-
56	-	99	-	-
57	-	99	-	-
58	-	99	-	-
59	-	99	-	-
60	-	99	-	-
n	205	190	52	61

Table 11
Centile ranks for the HISM-T Scale (Grade 3)

	GROUP			
	Rural Boys	Rural Girls	Urban Boys	Urban Girls
Score	Centile Rank	Centile Rank	Centile Rank	Centile Rank
20	<1	-	-	-
21	1	-	-	-
22	2	-	1	-
23	3	<1	2	1
24	3	1	3	3
25	4	1	4	6
26	5	2	5	7
27	7	4	6	7
28	10	6	6	7
29	13	8	7	9
30	16	10	9	10
31	18	12	12	14
32	20	14	18	19
33	29	17	24	23
34	34	21	30	24
35	39	26	42	27
36	45	33	51	31
37	54	39	55	37
38	59	47	59	44
39	65	52	67	51
40	70	57	75	58
41	75	63	80	63
42	80	68	83	74
43	84	75	83	79
44	87	79	84	84
45	90	82	85	87
46	92	85	87	90
47	94	88	89	91
48	95	91	90	92
49	97	93	93	93
50	98	94	96	94
51	98	95	97	96
52	99	96	98	98
53	99	97	98	99
54	99	98	99	-
55	99	98	99	-
56	99	98	99	-
57	99	99	-	-
58	99	99	-	-
59	-	99	-	-
59	-	99	-	-
60	-	99	-	-
n	207	190	51	62

Table 12
Urban boys mean correlations between behavior rating scales and achievement tests scores

Variables		Behavior Rating Scales: Adaptation	Behavior Rating Scales: Interpersonal
Total Achievement	$\bar{r}$	-.565*	-.290
	SE $\bar{r}$	.112	.100
	n	51	51
	k	4	4
Reading	$\bar{r}$	-.528*	-.352
	SE $\bar{r}$	.106	.113
	n	51	51
	k	4	4
Mathematics	$\bar{r}$	-.536*	-.247
	SE $\bar{r}$	.106	.101
	n	51	51
	k	4	4
Language Arts	$\bar{r}$	-.383	-.013
	SE $\bar{r}$	.238	.252
	n	27	27
	k	3	3
	Mean	5.54	4.57
	SD	3.28	2.46
	n	54	54

*p < .05; df=k-1

Table 13
Urban girls mean correlations between
behavior rating scales and achievement test scores

Variable		Behavior Rating Scales: Adaptation	Behavior Rating Scales: Interpersonal
Total Achievement	$\bar{r}$	-.530*	-.635*
	SE $\bar{r}$	.117	.120
	n	57	57
	k	4	4
Reading	$\bar{r}$	-.390	-.493
	SE $\bar{r}$	.174	.164
	n	57	57
	k	4	4
Mathematics	$\bar{r}$	-.542**	-.596*
	SE $\bar{r}$	.069	.108
	n	57	57
	k	4	4
Language Arts	$\bar{r}$	-.722**	-.660*
	SE $\bar{r}$	.029	.091
	n	27	27
	k	3	3
	Mean	4.01	4.01
	SD	2.98	2.45
	n	65	65
	k	4	4

* p <.05; df=k-1
**p <.01; df=k-1

$\bar{r}\ (b_1, b_2) = .748$

$SE_{\bar{r}} = .051$

n = 65

k = 4

Table 14
Rural boys mean correlations between
behavior rating scales and achievement test scores

Variable		Behavior Rating Scale: Adaptation	Behavior Rating Scale: Interpersonal
Total Achievement	$\bar{r}$	-.753**	-.517**
	SE $\bar{r}$	.028	.053
	n	167	167
	k	14	14
Reading	$\bar{r}$	-.641**	-.446**
	SE $\bar{r}$	.034	.066
	n	197	197
	k	17	17
Mathematics	$\bar{r}$	-.625**	-.463**
	SE $\bar{r}$	.046	.048
	n	196	196
	k	17	17
Language Arts	$\bar{r}$	-.665**	-.514**
	SE $\bar{r}$	.027	.075
	n	78	78
	k	6	6
	Mean	5.25	4.19
	SD	2.88	2.24
	n	213	213

**p < .01; df=k-1

$\bar{R}$ (B1,B2) = .747**

SE $\bar{r}$ = .049

n = 213

k = 17

Table 15
Rural girls mean correlations between
behavior rating scales and achievement scores

Variable		Behavior Rating Scales: Adaptation	Behavior Rating Scales: Interpersonal
Total Achievement	$\bar{r}$	-.657**	-.368**
	SE $\bar{r}$	.049	.063
	n	134	134
	k	13	13
Reading	$\bar{r}$	-.582**	-.289**
	SE $\bar{r}$	.052	.057
	n	168	168
	k	16	16
Mathematics	$\bar{r}$	-.594**	-.294**
	SE $\bar{r}$	.057	.080
	n	167	167
	k	16	16
Language Arts	$\bar{r}$	-.589**	-.231
	SE $\bar{r}$	.047	.137
	n	70	70
	k	5	5
	Mean	4.23	3.58
	SD	2.57	2.04
	n	191	191

** p <.01; df=k-1

$\bar{r}$ (B1,B2) = .721**

SE $_{\bar{r}}$ = .059

n = 170

k = 15

Table 16
Urban boys mean correlations between behavior rating scales and the HISM

Variable		Behavior Rating Scales: Adaption	Behavior Rating Scales: Interpersonal
HISM			
Trial 1	$\bar{r}$	.165	.118
	SE $\bar{r}$	.087	.049
	n	52	52
	k	4	4
HISM			
Trial 1	$\bar{r}$	.193	.320*
	SE $\bar{r}$	.209	.067
	n	51	51
	k	4	4
HISM			
Trial 2	$\bar{r}$	.122	.206
	SE $\bar{r}$	.321	.153
	n	48	48
	k	4	4
HISM	$\bar{r}$	.171	.338
	SE $\bar{r}$	.122	.119
	n	48	48
	k	4	4

*p < .05; df=3

Table 17
Urban girls mean correlations between behavior rating scales and the HISM.

Variable		Behavioral Rating Scale: Adaptation	Behavioral Rating Scale: Interpersonal
HISM			
Trial 1	$\bar{r}$	-.013	-.107
	SE $\bar{r}$	.279	.287
	n	61	61
	k	4	4
HISM			
Trial 1	$\bar{r}$	.161	.070
	SE $\bar{r}$	.088	.165
	n	62	62
	k	4	4
HISM			
Trial 2	$\bar{r}$	-.028	-.140
	SE $\bar{r}$	.262	.360
	n	60	60
	k	4	4
HISM			
Trial 2	$\bar{r}$	-.027	-.020
	SE $\bar{r}$	.109	.116
	n	60	60
	k	4	4

Table 18
Rural boys mean correlations betweeh
behavior rating scales and HISM

Variable		Behavior Rating Scale: Adaptation	Behavior Rating Scale: Interpersonal
HISM			
Trial 1	$\bar{r}$	.049	.024
	SE $\bar{r}$	.074	.061
	n	204	204
	k	17	17
HISM			
Trial 1	$\bar{r}$	.244**	.154*
	SE $\bar{r}$	.077	.060
	n	206	206
	k	17	17
HISM			
Trial 2	$\bar{r}$	.090	.012
	SE $\bar{r}$	.084	.070
	n	204	204
	k	17	17
HISM'			
Trial 2	$\bar{r}$	.217*	.173
	SE $\bar{r}$	.094	.083
	n	204	204
	k	17	17

*p < .05 ; df=16

**p < .01; df=16

Table 19
Rural girls mean correlations between
behavior rating scales and the HISM

Variable		Behavior Rating Scales: Adaptation	Behavior Rating Scales: Interpersonal
HISM Trial 1	$\bar{r}$	.123	.201*
	SE $\bar{r}$	.113	.077
	n	187	187
	k	16	16
HISM Trial 1	$\bar{r}$	.131	.136
	SE $\bar{r}$	.092	.070
	n	187	187
	k	16	16
HISM Trial 2	$\bar{r}$	.070	.149
	SE $\bar{r}$	.104	.076
	n	180	180
	k	16	16
HISM Trial 2	$\bar{r}$	.194**	.218**
	SE $\bar{r}$	.041	.046
	n	180	180
	k	16	16

*p < .05; df=15

**p < .01; df=15